UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,594	12/03/2004	Kristofer Skantze	3782-0300PUS1	8557

2292 7590 10/14/2008
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER	
MORRIS, JOEIN J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4147	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/14/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/516,594	SKANTZE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JOHN J. MORRIS	4147	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-50* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-50* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12/03/2004*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andersson J et al. (International Pub# WO 01/48678 A1/ *or "Andersson" hereinafter)* in view of Sahlberg et al. (US Pat# 6958757 B2/ *or "Sahlberg" hereinafter*).

For **claim 1,** Andersson teaches a digital unit that is designed to detect position data on a coded base (Andersson, figure 1, item 1). The coded base partly being generated from a graphical object (Andersson, figure 1) with at least one processing unit designed to receive data (Andersson, page 6, lines 21-24 and page 14, lines 23-28) (the recipient unit, such as a computer, is well known to have at least one processor). Andersson also teaches a storage unit for receiving and storing data (Andersson, page 4, lines 27-30) and a second interface for exposing and reading data (Andersson, page 14, lines 23-28 and lines 34-37). Andersson does not teach an allocation unit; however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches an allocation unit that produces position data for a graphical object (Sahlberg, column 2, lines 18-29). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the allocation unit of Sahlberg with Andersson so that the storage unit would store and use a

plurality of position data for graphical objects. This would have been obvious because Sahlberg's invention was intended to be used with a position coded device and it would have increased the ease of use of Andersson by allowing the user to use the device for multiple applications.

For **claim 2,** Andersson teaches a directing unit to direct the position data to a processing unit (Andersson, page 14, lines 24-33).

For **claim 3,** Andersson teaches the allocation data comprises an address identifier which is associated with a network address of a processing unit (Andersson, page 14, lines 24-33).

For **claim 39,** Andersson teaches the allocation data comprises an address identifier which is associated with a network address of a processing unit (Andersson, page 14, lines 24-33). Andersson teaches allocation data that comprises an object identifier which is associated with the current graphical object (Andersson, figure 1, items 1C-1F, page 16 lines 21-30). Andersson does not teach a rule object generator, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches a rule object generator which is designed to generate a rule object from a graphical object (Sahlberg, column 2, lines 18-29 and lines 47-50).

For **claim 4, 7, 8, 9, 26,** Andersson teaches the directing unit to receive position data, identify address identifier for the current processing unit, and sending address identifier to the digital unit (Andersson, page 14, lines 24-33).

Claim 6 is rejected upon the same grounds as claim 4.

For **claim 5,** Andersson teaches transferring address identifier (Andersson, page 14, lines 20-33).

For **claim 10, 12, 15, 24, 27, 28, 29, 40,** Andersson teaches allocation data that comprises an object identifier which is associated with the current graphical object (Andersson, figure 1, items 1C-1F, page 16 lines 21-30).

For **claim 11,** Andersson teaches the current processing unit, when receiving position data, to identify assigned rule object basis of object identifier (Andersson, page 5, lines 3-14).

For **claim 13, 14,** Andersson teaches wherein all object identifiers are stored in the storage unit (Andersson, page 5, lines 3-6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the selection of the graphical object would only be allowed if the object identifier of the graphical object

matched an object identifier in the system. If it did not match the system would not know how to process that information.

For **claim 16**, Andersson teaches the object identifier computable based on the graphical image (Andersson, page 27, lines 26-34).

For **claim 17**, Andersson does not teach a browser for selecting graphical objects, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches a template server for selecting graphical objects (Sahlberg, figure 1, item 103). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the user to browse the template server to find the template with the graphical object needed.

For **claim 18, 20, 21,** Andersson does not teach a generating the coded base, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches printing graphic information and position data (Sahlberg, figure 1 item 109 and 110, and abstract lines 1-8). It is well known in the art that an image file is graphic information and in order to print an image file, it would be converted to a print file format.

For **claim 19,** Andersson teaches a digital unit that is designed to detect position data on a coded base (Andersson, figure 1, item 1). The coded base partly being generated from a graphical object (Andersson, figure 1) with at least one processing unit designed to receive data (Andersson, page 6, lines 21-24 and page 14, lines 23-28) (the

recipient unit, such as a computer, is well known to have at least one processor). Andersson also teaches a storage unit for receiving and storing data (Andersson, page 4, lines 27-30) and a second interface for exposing and reading data (Andersson, page 14, lines 23-28 and lines 34-37).

For **claim 22,** Andersson does not teach a rule object generator, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches a rule object generator which is designed to generate a rule object from a graphical object (Sahlberg, column 2, lines 18-29 and lines 47-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store the rule generator in the storage unit of Andersson. This is obvious because the storage unit is meant to store data and other data is already being stored in the storage unit.

For **claim 23,** Andersson teaches a digital unit that is designed to detect position data on a coded base (Andersson, figure 1, item 1). The coded base partly being generated from a graphical object (Andersson, figure 1). With a plurality of processing units designed to receive data (Andersson, page 6, lines 21-24 and page 14, lines 23-28) (the recipient units, such as a computer, is well known to have at least one processor). Andersson teaches a directing unit to direct the position data to a processing unit (Andersson, page 14, lines 24-33). Andersson does not teach an allocation unit; however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches an allocation unit that produces position data for a graphical object (Sahlberg, column 2, lines 18-29). It would have been obvious

for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the allocation unit of Sahlberg with Andersson so that the storage unit would store and use a plurality of position data for graphical objects and because both deal with the same subject manner.

For **claim 25,** Andersson does not teach assigning position data, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches assigning position data to an object (Sahlberg, column 3, lines 14-18).

For **claim 30, 33,** Andersson teaches a digital unit that is designed to detect position data on a coded base (Andersson, figure 1, item 1). The coded base partly being generated from a graphical object (Andersson, figure 1). With a plurality of processing units designed to receive data (Andersson, page 6, lines 21-24 and page 14, lines 23-28) (the recipient units, such as a computer, is well known to have at least one processor). Andersson teaches that all or parts of the recorded information are sent to the processing units (Andersson, page 7, lines 3-5). It would have been obvious that the allocation data would be included in the information sent because it is part of the recorded information. Andersson teaches a directing unit to direct the position data to a processing unit (Andersson, page 14, lines 24-33). Andersson does not teach a rule object generator, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches a rule object generator which is designed to generate a rule object from a graphical object (Sahlberg, column 2, lines 18-29 and lines 47-50). Andersson does not teach an allocation unit; however, in the same

field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches an allocation unit that produces position data for a graphical object (Sahlberg, column 2, lines 18-29). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the allocation unit of Sahlberg with Andersson so that the storage unit would store and use a plurality of position data for graphical objects.

For **claim 31, 43,** Andersson teaches a database with the current graphical objects (Andersson, page 5, lines 3-6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the database could receive the current graphical object and that the processing unit could obtain the current graphical object from the database because receiving and sending information from a database is well known in the art.

For **claim 32, 44,** Andersson teaches allocation data that comprises an object identifier which is associated with the current graphical object (Andersson, figure 1, items 1C-1F, page 16 lines 21-30). Andersson teaches wherein all object identifiers are stored in the storage unit (Andersson, page 5, lines 3-6). It is obvious that this object identifier would allow the processing unit to locate the current graphical object because the object identifier is a unique identifier; therefore there are a number of well known techniques to locate such an identifier.

For **claim 34,** Andersson teaches allocation data that comprises an object identifier which is associated with the current graphical object (Andersson, figure 1, items 1C-1F, page 16 lines 21-30). Andersson teaches allocation data that comprises an object identifier which is associated with the current graphical object (Andersson, figure 1, items 1C-1F, page 16 lines 21-30). Andersson also teaches the current processing unit, when receiving position data, to identify assigned rule object basis of object identifier (Andersson, page 5, lines 3-14). Andersson does not teach assigning position data, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches assigning position data to an object (Sahlberg, column 3, lines 14-18). Andersson does not teach a generating the coded base, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches printing graphic information and position data (Sahlberg, figure 1 item 109 and 110, and abstract lines 1-8). Andersson does not teach a rule object generator, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches a rule object generator which is designed to generate a rule object from a graphical object (Sahlberg, column 2, lines 18-29 and lines 47-50).

For **claim 35,** Andersson does not teach assigning position data, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches assigning position data to an object (Sahlberg, column 3, lines 14-18). Andersson does not teach a rule object generator, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches a rule object generator which is designed to generate a rule object from a graphical object (Sahlberg, column 2, lines 18-29 and lines 47-50). Andersson does not teach a generating the coded base, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches printing graphic information and position data

(Sahlberg, figure 1 item 109 and 110, and abstract lines 1-8). It is obvious that the position data would need to be converted to a local coordinate system in order to be printed.

For **claim 36, 37,** Andersson teaches an imagery surface which is divided into groups of positions (regions) where the knowledge of the divisions is used in processing the read position data (Andersson, page 14, lines 23-28).

For **claim 38,** Andersson teaches rule object information that defines a relation to a position data reference point (Andersson, page 5, lines 3-14). Andersson also teaches that this data can be connected to graphic information on a substrate (Andersson, figure 1, items 1C-1F, page 16 lines 21-30).

For **claim 41, 42,** Andersson teaches using a position code which defines a position area with predetermined subdivision (Andersson, page 5, lines 4-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the subdivision could be of equal size if desired. Andersson teaches providing all recorded information (Andersson, page 7, lines 3-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the rule object and allocation would be included in the sent data. Andersson does not teach assigning position data, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches assigning position data to an object (Sahlberg, column 3, lines 14-18). Andersson does not teach a rule

object generator, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches a rule object generator which is designed to generate a rule object from a graphical object (Sahlberg, column 2, lines 18-29 and lines 47-50). Andersson does not teach a generating the coded base, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches printing graphic information and position data (Sahlberg, figure 1 item 109 and 110, and abstract lines 1-8). It is obvious that the position data would need to be converted to a local coordinate system in order to be printed.

For **claim 45,** Andersson teaches a directing unit to direct the position data to a processing unit (Andersson, page 14, lines 24-33). Andersson does not teach assigning position/allocation data, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches assigning position/allocation data to an object (Sahlberg, column 3, lines 14-18). Andersson does not teach a rule object generator, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches a rule object generator which is designed to generate a rule object from a graphical object (Sahlberg, column 2, lines 18-29 and lines 47-50). Andersson does not teach a generating the coded base, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches printing graphic information and position data (Sahlberg, figure 1 item 109 and 110, and abstract lines 1-8). It is obvious that the position data would need to be converted to a local coordinate system in order to be printed.

For **claim 46,** Andersson teaches allocation data that comprises an object identifier which is associated with the current graphical object (Andersson, figure 1, items 1C-1F, page 16 lines 21-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the object identifier with the position data because both deal with the same object. Andersson does not teach assigning position/allocation data, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches assigning position/allocation data to an object (Sahlberg, column 3, lines 14-18).

For **claim 47,** Andersson teaches storing an association between each object identifier and a network address (Andersson, page 4 lines 27-36, page 5 lines 1-2).

For **claim 48, 49, 50,** Andersson teaches generating an instance identifier to identify the assignment of position data and graphical data (Andersson, page 35, lines 9-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that this could be included in the allocation data because it is another identifier for the same object.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN J. MORRIS whose telephone number is (571)270-7171. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7am - 3pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kieu-Oanh Bui can be reached on (571)272-7291. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/KIEU-OANH BUI/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4147

JOHN J MORRIS
Examiner
Art Unit 4147

***